

ISAC MEETING – December 2011

FINAL ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

Action Items

- 1) From the Organizational Collaboration Subcommittee: If possible, starting with the most recent class there will be announcements or letters sent the appointees' Congressional delegation for the new and reappointed members of ISAC.

Approved.

- 2) From the Research Subcommittee: To enhance collaboration and cooperation between researchers and policy makers working on invasive species, the Research Subcommittee will invite the Invasive Species Working Group of the Committee on Environment, and Natural Resources Sustainability in the Office of Science and Technology Policy to meet jointly with them at the ISAC meeting in the fall of 2012.

Approved.

Background: The ISWG, the only group under OSTP devoted to invasive species, comprises representatives from governmental agencies both within and outside NISC. A number of ISWG members have participated in ISAC meetings and one current ISAC Research Subcommittee member belongs to ISWG. A joint meeting will help ISWG and ISAC coordinate their efforts for greater effect and efficiency, and the simplest vehicle is a meeting with a subcommittee of ISAC.

- 3) From the Research Subcommittee: Action Item: ISAC requests that NISC agencies, particularly the Department of Transportation, report to ISAC any actions taken in response to Recommendation 4 from the June 2011 meeting of ISAC.

H. Diaz-Soltero – are you asking only Dept. of Transportation? *It's not only, it's particularly.*

Approved.

Background: This recommendation stated that "In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), ISAC recommends that NISC Departments, Agencies and their contractors assess the risk of invasiveness whenever their activities lead to the introduction of [non-native] species or their subsets (i.e. moving organisms from where they occur to where they have never occurred historically)." Two key elements of this recommendation are that it includes introductions between states within the U.S. and introductions of a subset of a species.

- 4) From the Communication, Education, and Outreach Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC disseminate the White Paper trailers at the 2012 NISAW Meeting and throughout the email contact list that has been developed of related state organizations.

Approved.

5) From the Control and Management Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC asks APHIS their position on the use of genetically modified insects and other organisms for the management of invasive species. In particular, what risks and benefits do they see from the use of this technology?

L. Williams – what is the goal with this? A written response will be sufficient.

Approved.

6) From the Control and Management Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC consult with major federal land management agencies, including BLM, Forest Service, National Park Service and other agencies on whether they have problems with invasive organisms that they could help address by the registration of currently unavailable products through the IR-4 program. In addition, if they can benefit from new registrations, would they provide some level of funding to support the process?

Approved.

7) When developing the Agenda for ISAC Meetings, the Vice Chair should communicate with all speakers to confirm final details and attendance.

Approved.

8) ISAC asks NISC to wish Gordon Brown a speedy recovery.

Approved.

Recommendations

1) From the EDRR Subcommittee: ISAC recommends that NISC support and encourage the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences review of frameworks for the validation of advanced molecular assays for aquatic invasive species detection technologies and their protocols.

D. Starling – this concerns the PCR effort that has been worked on.

P. Alpert – is it the National Research Council that does this? What is the cost?

Between \$200,000 and \$300,000. Does NISC have this? NISC agencies pay for this.

B. Wiltshire moved to accept the recommendation as presented. Seconded by B. McMahon and N. Stone. Approved by general consent.

2) From the Research Subcommittee: Expanding trade across the Pacific poses a dual challenge to the control of invasive species. First, there is a high potential for introductions of new species in both directions. Second, there is a high potential that some introduced species will become invasive because of similarities between the climates and ecology of central and eastern Asia and North America.

(Recommendation #2 continued)

In light of these challenges and the potential negative impacts of the introduction of invasive species in either direction across the Pacific on the economies and environment of the U.S. and its trading partners in eastern Asia, ISAC recommends that the Department of State seek the cooperation of appropriate agencies in convening a multilateral meeting of scientists and governmental representatives from APEC countries to develop measures to prevent the introduction of invasive species in the course of transpacific commerce.

L. Williams – directing this to the Secretary of State and it might not be the right person.

S. Burgiel – wondering in the context of the range of agencies if it shouldn't be other NISC member agencies?

J. Peter Thompson – does it have to be NISC member agencies?

P. Brady – **has ISAC ever directed anything to OSTP?** *We are an advisory group to NISC, not OSTP.*

J. Peter Thompson – P. Johnson serves/served on the OSTP group and was familiar enough to make this connection.

H. Diaz-Soltero – she saw the usefulness of OSTP and is why it was suggested.

J. Peter Thompson – can we table this until tomorrow's meeting.

Suggestion is to take OSTP out.

B. McMahon moved that we remove OSTP from the recommendation. S. Ellis seconded.

Discussion followed.

- **J. Peter Thompson** – this changes the meaning of the recommendation.

- **M. Meyers** – you could take it out and then include explanatory language when it's sent over.

C. Smith moved to accept the amended recommendation, as edited above. Seconded by D. Starling. One NO vote cast by J.P. Thompson. Approved by general consent.

- 3) **Recommendation regarding U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** ISAC recommends that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers immediately reinstate the funding for the Aquatic Plant Control Research Program due to its national importance in the control and management of aquatic invasive plants.

P. Alpert – it's not the Corps of Engineers that is terminating the funding. Yes it is.

D. Waitt to approve the recommendation as written. Seconded by B. McMahon. Approved by general consent.

(There was also a suggestion to mention the fact that cutting the program now is just deferring the cost)

- 4) Recommendation regarding ARS: ISAC recommends full funding in FY 12 for ARS research programs in biological control and other invasive species programs and projects, including systematics.

P. Alpert – more preparation for this would have been nice.

P. Brady – Six months from now we could have this conversation about other programs. Perhaps we should be thinking about strategies for dealing with reductions everywhere.

B. Harper-Lore – could we see if this works with recommendation #3.

J. Peter Thompson – can we change it to continue support.

E. Chilton – we did that before and it was still cut.

B. Van Steenwyk – ARS does a lot more than invasive species with biocontrol. Might want to be more specific.

Public: Funding comes from both National Institute of Food & Agriculture and ARS and they both need a push to get the funding back. We need this more than ever. Would request that NIFA be added.

P. Brady – might want to ask for a budget analysis for the next meeting to assess where we're losing strength.

H. Diaz-Soltero – this came up when crafting recommendation #3. Congress has given USDA their money and this sends a message to redirect what has already been funded.

B. Wiltshire – what is the difference between Corps program and ARS? Are they both being eliminated. Yes.

E. Lane – not all ARS biological control stations are being cut are they? More than one is being cut.

S. Kedzie – can OMB provide analysis on this topic?

D. Waitt – nice presentation on the aquatic biocontrol that led to the recommendation. We're trying to do this with very little information.

B. McMahon – this is general and we haven't had a lot of time on this. Is it possible for the Steering Committee have this at the next meeting.

E. Chilton – the station that is being closed is parallel to what the Corps is working on.

P. Brady – if we're considering items like this for Spring then would like to offer up the USGS NAS database.

J. Peter Thompson – it'd be nice to see what work and the impacts at the next meeting.

E. Mills – thinking more strategic, what are the best strategies to deal with cutting budgets across agencies in respect to invasive species.

J. P. Thompson moved to approve this recommendation as written. E. Lane seconded. Motion failed by a vote of 16 to 5.

Follow-up discussion on proposed Recommendation #4 (above)

B. Wiltshire recommends that as an action item for the Spring meeting is to have this as a topic.

E. Lane – funding cuts are going to be significant across the agencies. Can we be more strategic? This is an intense discussion. Can we schedule some time at the Spring meeting to more thoroughly discuss this?

S. Kedzie – where are we going to acquire this information?

L. Williams – this is going to be tricky as the agencies don't know exactly where the cuts are going to be. Could possibly get some information about 2012 and will know the President's budget for 2013. Lost our contact at OMB but could possibly get someone at the meeting.

B. McMahon – can the Steering Committee work on this for the June meeting? Yes and appropriate ISAC members will be involved.

S. Ellis – it's in the bylaws to develop these straw man documents.

C. Dionigi – idea of strategizing this is good but there are a lot of layers to this and the discussion should be around invasive species and if a program is going to get cut, how is it going to get cut and could we have input in this.

P. Brady – ISAC will be helpful in determining the impacts in what we see in FY 2013.